IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE SEVENTH DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE GOPALA KRISHNA TAMADA

WRIT PETITION NO : 591 of 1998

Between:

M/s. Suraksha Homes, Rep. Managing Partner- Sri K.R.K.Prasad,
R/o. 8-3-318/11/16, Jayaprakashngar,
Ameerpet, Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Dy.Superintendent of Police,
Balanagar, Ranga Reddy District.
2 The Inspector of Police (SSO),
Chandanagar P.S., Ranga Reddy District.
3 Sri Eddu Balaiah, S/o. Chittari,
R/o. 3-45, Chandanagar (V), Sherilingampally,
R.R.dist.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue a writ or direction more particularly in the nature of Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents 1 and 2 herein not to interfere in the possession and enjoyment and construction work of the petitioner over the plots covered by approved HUDA sanctioned layout No. 1185/MP2/HUDA/92, of SURAKSHA ENCLAVE from out of Sy.Nos. 258 and 266 of Chandanagar (V), Sherilingampally (M), R.R.District.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.VENKATA RAM REDDY PANDUGA

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed seeking a direction to the respondents 1 and 2 not to interfere with the possession, enjoyment and construction work of the petitioner over the plots covered by HUDA approved sanction lay out No.1185/MP2/HUDA/92 of Suraksha Enclave, from out of Survey No.258 and 266 of Chandanagar Village, Sherilingampally Mandal, Ranga Reddy District.

This Court while issuing rule nisi, granted interim direction by its order dated 06-01-1998.

Now, the respondents have filed a counter and in paragraph No.2 of the said counter, respondents 1 and 2 have categorically stated that the respondents are unaware of the subject matter in the writ petition and it is only after receipt of the Court notice, they came to know about the same and then caused enquiries and learnt that the petitioner's firm purchased vacant land in S.Nos. 258 and 266 of Chandanagar Village for construction of houses and that there are some disputes existing between the petitioner's firm and the 3rd respondent with regard to the sale of the land.

In view of the interim orders passed by this Court and in view of the categorical statement made by respondents 1 and 2 that they have nothing to do with the construction made by the petitioner in the petition schedule lands, this Court is of the view that no further orders are necessary to be passed in this writ petition.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of.

_____

07-12-2004

vs

To

1 The Dy.Superintendent of Police,
Balanagar, Ranga Reddy District.
2 The Inspector of Police (SSO),
Chandanagar P.S., Ranga Reddy District.
3. Two CCs to G.P. for Home, High Court Buildings,

Hyderabad. (OUT)

4. Two C.D. copies.